A.F.R.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.23072 of 2025

CNR No-ODHC010582062025

(In the matter of an application under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, 1950).

Shri Chitta Ranjan Dash **....** ***Petitioner (s)***

-versus-

State of Odisha & Ors. **....** ***Opposite Party (s)***

Advocates appeared in the case through Hybrid Mode**:**

For Petitioner (s) : *Mr. Prafulla Kumar Rath, Sr. Adv.*
along with associates

For Opposite Party (s) : *Mr. Satyabrata Mohanty, AGA*
Mr. Manmay Kumar Dash, ASC
Mr. Bigyan Kumar Sharma, Sr. Adv.
along with associates
Mr. Dipti Ranjan Bhokta, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MURAHARI SRI RAMAN

DATE OF HEARING:-16.10.2026
DATE OF JUDGMENT:-02.11.2026

Dr. Sanjeeb K Panigrahi, J.

1. The present Writ Petition raises a question concerning the entitlement of a retired Judge of this Court, who was subsequently transferred to another High Court and retired from there, to post-retirement allowances from the High Court to which he was initially appointed. The immediate dispute concerns the expenses towards domestic help, driver, secretarial assistance, security and telephone facilities. The

Petitioner seeks parity in the matter of these benefits with other retired Judges of this Court, contending that the State cannot segregate his entitlement confining to medical facilities from his parent High Court while denying the other post-retirement benefits on the ground that he retired from the Calcutta High Court.

I. FACTUAL MATRIX OF THE CASE:

2. The Petitioner was elevated as a Judge of this Court on 7 October 2009. He was thereafter transferred to the Calcutta High Court by notification dated 1.6.2022 and assumed office there on 20.6.2022. He demitted office on attaining the age of superannuation on 20.5.2024.

3. Before his retirement, the Petitioner expressed his desire to avail his post-retirement benefits, including medical facilities and allowances towards domestic help and other services, from his parent High Court, namely, this Court. The matter was taken up with the State Government for a decision. By order No. 32393 dated 31.7.2025, issued by the Home Department, Government of Odisha, the Petitioner was permitted to avail medical facilities from his parent High Court. The order, however, did not sanction the other allowances claimed by him.

4. The Petitioner thereafter represented against the omission to extend the remaining benefits. As the grievance remained unaddressed, the present writ petition came to be filed challenging the decision of the State Government insofar as it restricts the benefits available to the Petitioner to medical reimbursement alone.

5. The relevant policy framework includes the Home Department notification dated 24.4.2025, issued in pursuance of the directions of the

Hon'ble Supreme Court. Under the said notification, a consolidated amount of ₹45,000 per month is provided to a retired Judge or spouse towards domestic help and driver expenses, while ₹15,000 per month is provided towards telephone, internet, secretarial and security services, subject to the prescribed conditions. The amounts are subject to an annual increase of five per cent.

II. SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner was initially appointed as a Judge of this Court and continues to be entitled to the post-retirement benefits available to retired Judges of this Court. His subsequent transfer to the Calcutta High Court, according to the Petitioner, does not extinguish his entitlement to elect the parent High Court from which to avail the benefits.

7. It is contended that the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Justice V.S. Dave, President, Association of Retired Judges of Supreme Court and High Courts v. Kusumjit Sidhu and Others***[1], must be read as a whole. The directions concerning domestic help, drivers, telephone reimbursement and other benefits are distinct from those relating to medical reimbursement. The clarification issued on 15.4.2025 recognises that, in the case of a Judge transferred from one High Court to another, the concerned State Government may be the State where the Judge was first appointed or the State from which the Judge retired.

8. Learned counsel further submits that the State itself, through its notification dated 24.4.2025, has made the availability of the facilities

[1] (in Contempt Petition (Civil) Nos. 425–426 of 2015 in W.P. (C) No. 523 of 2002)

conditional upon the retired Judge not availing the same or similar facilities from another High Court. The condition, according to the Petitioner, is directed against the duplication of benefits and not against a Judge who elects to receive the benefits from his parent High Court. The Petitioner having opted for this Court and having been granted medical facilities by the State, the remaining benefits cannot be denied solely on the basis of the place of his retirement.

III. SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE STATE:

9. Learned counsel appearing for the State submits that the Petitioner retired from the Calcutta High Court and, therefore, cannot claim the benefits under the Odisha scheme, which is framed for retired Chief Justices and Judges of the Orissa High Court. It is submitted that the order dated 15.4.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court was a clarification concerning the State responsible for medical reimbursement and does not expressly direct that all other post-retirement allowances must also be paid by the parent High Court.

10. The State relies upon the notification dated 24.4.2025 and the earlier departmental orders governing the grant of post-retirement allowances. It is contended that the eligibility conditions under the notification do not extend the benefits to a Judge who retired from another High Court. The State also refers to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 31.3.2014 in *P. Ramakrishnam Raju v. Union of India*, Civil Appeal Nos. 4248–4249 of 2014 and connected matters, submitting that the observations therein do not confer an enforceable right to claim every category of allowance from the parent High Court.

IV. ISSUE FOR CONSIDERATION:

11. In view of the rival submissions, the solitary issue that arises for consideration is:

> Whether the Petitioner, having been initially appointed as a Judge of this Court and having elected to avail his post-retirement benefits from this Court, is entitled to claim the allowances towards domestic help, driver, secretarial assistance, security and telephone facilities from the State of Odisha, notwithstanding that he retired from the Calcutta High Court?

12. The issue must be examined in the light of the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court from time to time, the object underlying those directions, and the terms of the State's own notification. The orders cannot be read in isolation or in a manner that renders one part of the scheme inconsistent with the object of the directions as a whole.

13. This Court also considers it apposite to preface the discussion by reproducing the relevant paragraphs of this Court's judgment in ***Orissa High Court Retired Judges' Association & Anr. v. Union of India & Ors.***[2] where this Hon'ble Court was pleased to hold that:

> *"10. It is needless to mention here that during the tenure as a sitting Judge, the pay scales and other allowances are almost equal all over the country and the services of judges are governed in equal manner. Therefore, after the retirement, it would be feasible for all the State Governments to extend the facilities such as medical facilities, orderly/domestic help allowance, telephone charges to the retired Judges of the High Courts throughout the country uniformly so as to enable them to lead a dignified life after*

[2] (2012) 114 CLT 560

their retirement for the reason that after retirement of a permanent judge or Chief Justice, there is prohibition for their practice in the same High Court from which they retired. Therefore, after the retirement of Judges or Chief Justices, they are required to be treated with due respect and the State Governments have got constitutional obligation to see that they lead a dignified & happy retired life of their remaining period for having rendered service to the public litigant and facilitated the State Government for good governance.

However, from the chart pre-page, it is seen that various State Governments are providing medical facilities and other allowances in different manner to the retired High Court judges of their State. Vide Home Department Letter No. 7056 dated 14.02.2011 the Government of Odisha extended the medical allowances to the retired Chief Justices and Judges of this court @ Rs.18,000/- P.A. w.e.f. 14.02.2011, which is very meager amount taking into consideration of devaluation of a rupee and cost of the facility. In the old age, different ailments may be there and it may not be possible to meet the actual medical expenses with the said amount of Rs.18,000/- per annum. As it appears from the above chart, it is a fact that throughout the country uniform medical facilities are not provided to the retired Judges by the State Governments and different State Governments are providing different medical facilities to the retired Judges as shown in the chart. The Odisha State is coming under the Eastern region of the country. Therefore, we think it would be appropriate to direct the Government of Odisha to take into consideration the medical facilities extended to the retired Judges by the States coming under the Eastern region of the country and take a decision in extending the medical benefits to the members of the petitioner-Association taking into account the Central Government Health Scheme. We think, it will be in conformity with Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India. The Supreme Court in catena of cases

has held that right to lead a happy life includes the right to health which is guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. In the cases of State of Punjab Vs. Mohinder Singh Chawla, reported in AIR 1997 SC 1225; and Consumer Education & Research Centre & ors. Vs. Union of India & Ors., AIR 1995 SC 922, the Supreme Court has held that right to life includes the right to health.

11. It is an undisputed fact that during incumbency Judges and Chief Justices of the High Courts lead a distinct lifestyle being provided with many facilities and assistance including telephone facilities. Immediately after retirement if all those facilities are withdrawn, it will be definitely difficult on the part of a retired Judge to lead a dignified and happy life without proper assistance from the State Government as it is its constitutional function. Therefore, in our view order/domestic assistance as well as telephone facility is also the basic requirement of a retired Judge for decent living. To maintain a good healthy life after retirement as a Judge the minimum requirement is to see that proper medical facilities are provided by the State Government to lead a healthy and happy life during old age, domestic help/assistance is required to assist in the day to day work, and telephone facilities/allowance as an emergency service required for them. These three assistance are very much essential to a person who has already led a dignified life and retired from the post and at this stage it is the duty of the State Government to provide the above facilities to the retired Judges in the State. Therefore, taking into consideration of all the aforesaid aspects, the State Government is hereby directed to modify the order dated 14.2.2011 under Annexure-3 accordingly and further to provide telephone allowance taking into account such facility/allowance extended by the other States under the Eastern region of the country by framing necessary Rules and guidelines as early as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. However, such

facilities and allowance shall not be made available to the retired Judge if he/she is getting such benefit by virtue of holding any assignment/post/commission etc."

14. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide judgment dated 31.3.2014 in ***P. Ramakrishnam Raju v. Union of India***[3], while considering the question of post-retirement benefits, observed in paragraphs 33 and 34 as follows:

"33. It is brought to our notice that in pursuance of the said Resolution, most of the States in the country have extended various post-retiral benefits to the retired Chief Justices and retired judges of the respective High Courts. By G.O.Ms.No. 28 dated 16.03.2012 issued by Law Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh sanctioned an amount of Rs.14,000/- per month to the retired Chief justices of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh and an amount of Rs.12,000/- per month to the retired judges of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh for defraying the services of an orderly, driver, security guard etc. and for meeting expenses incurred towards secretarial assistance on contract basis and a residential telephone free of cost with number of free calls to the extent of 1500 per month over and above the number of free calls per month allowed by the telephone authorities to both the retired Chief justices and judges of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh w.e.f. 01.04.2012.

34.While appreciating the steps taken by the Government of Andhra Pradesh and other States who have already formulated such scheme, by this order, we hope and trust that the States who have not so far framed such scheme will formulate the same, depending on the local conditions, for the benefit of the retired Chief Justices and retired Judges of the respective High Courts as early as possible preferably

[3] Civil Appeal Nos. 4248–4249 of 2014 and connected matters

within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this order."

15. The aforesaid observations placed the question of post-retirement allowances in the broader context of facilities for retired Judges and encouraged States to formulate appropriate schemes. While the judgment, by itself, did not prescribe a uniform amount payable by every State, the subsequent orders in the contempt proceedings addressed implementation of the Andhra Pradesh model and the need to extend the corresponding facilities across States.

16. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide order dated 23.2.2017 in Contempt Petition (Civil) Nos. 425–426 of 2015 in W.P. (C) No. 523 of 2002, recorded that the States of Jharkhand, Odisha and Himachal Pradesh had sanctioned allowances under the Andhra Pradesh model with effect from 1 October 2014. The Court thereafter directed:

> *"Taking note of the above, we close all these matters with a direction that all the States will adhere to the payment of allowance on the Andhra Pradesh Model with effect from 1st October, 2014. All amounts due in terms of the present order and the orders passed in the matters from time to time will be paid as expeditiously as possible."*

17. The direction is material for two reasons. First, the allowances towards domestic help, drivers, security and telephone facilities were not treated as merely discretionary or incidental benefits but they formed the subject of directions requiring compliance by the States. Secondly, the State of Odisha has itself recorded as having sanctioned allowances as per the Andhra Pradesh model. The consequential question is

therefore not whether Odisha may frame a scheme for such allowances, but whether the eligibility criteria under its scheme can be applied to exclude the Petitioner solely because he retired from another High Court.

18. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide order dated 1.5.2017 in I.A. No. 11 of 2017 in the same contempt proceedings, while dealing specifically with domestic help and telephone allowance, held:

> *"Insofar as prayer (a) above is concerned, the relief prayed for is covered by the directions issued in paragraph 4 of the order of this Court dated 23rd February, 2017 passed in Contempt Petition (Civil) No. 425-426 of 2015 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 523 of 2002. The State of Himachal Pradesh is directed to pay the allowances as per the Andhra Pradesh Model with effect from 1st October, 2014 to the applicant(s) and all other retired judges of the High Court forthwith if the same has not been paid."*

19. The order confirms that the directions concerning the Andhra Pradesh model extend specifically to domestic help and telephone allowances. The issue before this Court is not one of creating a new benefit but of determining the State from which an eligible retired Judge may claim the benefits already recognised under the applicable scheme.

20. The position was reiterated in the order dated 18.2.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the same contempt proceedings. After dealing with medical facilities and reimbursement, the Court separately adverted to the earlier order concerning domestic help and telephone reimbursement. Paragraphs 13 and 14 read as follows:

> *"13. We are informed that on 1st May, 2017, an order has been passed by this Court dealing with the issue of domestic help and telephone bill reimbursement. Even compliance with this order shall be reported as directed above.*
>
> *14. We make it clear that the said order clarifies that the facilities available to the retired Judges in the State of Andhra Pradesh shall be extended to all the retired Judges in all other States and Union Territories. If after the said order, the Andhra Pradesh Government is giving better facilities to the retired Judges in the State, it follows that even other States must also extend the same facilities."*

21. The significance of these paragraphs lies in the express treatment of domestic help and telephone reimbursement as a separate aspect of compliance. The direction to extend the Andhra Pradesh facilities to retired Judges in other States cannot be confined to medical reimbursement alone. The State is, therefore, required to consider the Petitioner's claim under the applicable scheme in the light of the directions governing these allowances as well.

22. The question of the appropriate State in cases of transfer was specifically considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its order dated 15.4.2025 in the same proceedings. The Court noted that Judges may be appointed in one High Court and retire from another High Court following transfer. The relevant clarification reads:

> *"When we say the concerned State Government, it will be the State Government where the seat of the High Court is situated in which the retired Judge was firstly appointed or the State Government where the seat of the High Court is situated from which the learned Judge has retired."*

23. The clarification is of particular relevance to the present case. It recognises two possible connecting High Courts for identifying the concerned State Government: the High Court in which the Judge was first appointed and the High Court from which the Judge retired. The Petitioner falls squarely within the class of Judges contemplated by the clarification, having been first appointed to this Court and thereafter transferred to the Calcutta High Court.

24. The State is correct to point out that the clarification dated 15.4.2025 arose in the context of paragraph 9 of the order dated 18.2.2025, which dealt with reimbursement for medical treatment. It would not be appropriate to hold that the clarification, read in isolation, expressly adjudicates every question concerning each category of post-retirement allowance.

25. However, that is not the end of the matter. The clarification must be read alongside the distinct directions concerning domestic help, drivers, telephone and other benefits, including the direction dated 18.2.2025 that the Andhra Pradesh model be extended to retired Judges across the country. The combined effect of the orders is to recognise that the State connected with the Judge's first appointment may be the concerned State Government; the clarification does not restrict that principle to the place of retirement alone.

26. The subsequent order dated 29.4.2025 further demonstrates that the Hon'ble Supreme Court continued to treat the relevant benefits as a distinct category of compliance. In that order, the Court identified the directions requiring compliance, including:

> *"Direction No. 6: Domestic Help(s)/Driver, Telephone and other benefits in line with the benefits granted by the State of Andhra Pradesh, and improved from time to time."*

The inclusion of this direction alongside the directions concerning medical treatment, reimbursement and cashless facilities reinforces the distinction between the different categories of post-retirement benefits. The State cannot, therefore, answer the claim for domestic help and other allowances merely by pointing out that the order dated 15.4.2025 arose in the context of medical reimbursement.

27. The above position must now be considered alongside the Home Department notification dated 24.4.2025. The notification provides a consolidated monthly amount towards domestic help and driver expenses and a further amount towards telephone, internet, secretarial and security services. It also prescribes the following eligibility condition:

> "*The facility of Domestic Help(s), Driver(s), Secretarial Assistance, Security and Telephone facility shall be provided to the retired Chief Justice/Judge of the Orissa High Court or their spouse, if he/she is not availing such or similar facility from any other High Court."*

28. The condition is significant. It does not expressly state that a Judge who was initially appointed to the Orissa High Court but retired from another High Court shall, for that reason alone, stand excluded from the scheme. Instead, it makes non-availment of the same or similar facility from another High Court a condition for receiving the benefit.

The evident purpose of this stipulation is to prevent duplication of facilities. It cannot reasonably be read as automatically disqualifying a transferred Judge who elects to receive the benefits from the High Court to which he was first appointed, particularly when the Hon'ble Supreme Court has expressly recognised that the concerned State may be either the State of first appointment or the State of retirement.

29. The State's interpretation would result in a transferred Judge being recognised as entitled to medical facilities from the parent High Court, but being denied the remaining post-retirement allowances by that very High Court solely because he retired elsewhere. No such categorical exclusion is apparent from the language of the notification. Nor has any intelligible differentia been demonstrated to justify treating a Judge initially appointed to this Court differently from other retired Judges of this Court, where the former has elected to avail the benefits here and does not draw the same or similar benefits from another High Court.

30. The Petitioner has elected to avail his post-retirement benefits from this Court. The State has accepted that election to the extent of medical facilities. The same choice cannot be rejected in respect of the remaining benefits without a clear basis in the applicable scheme. The condition relating to non-availment of similar benefits from another High Court is capable of being applied to the Petitioner in a manner consistent with both the notification and the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Such an interpretation gives effect to the scheme while preventing double benefits. A narrower construction, based solely on the fact of

retirement from the Calcutta High Court, would introduce a disqualification that the notification does not expressly provide and would be inconsistent with the Hon'ble Supreme Court's clarification recognising the State of first appointment as a concerned State Government.

31. A transfer from one High Court to another is an incident of judicial service. It does not erase the years spent serving the High Court to which the Judge was initially appointed, nor does it sever the institutional association that arose from such appointment. A Judge who has served in more than one High Court has, in fact, discharged judicial responsibilities in each of them. It would, therefore, require a clear provision in the governing scheme before the mere circumstance of retirement from the transferee High Court could be treated as sufficient to extinguish the claim to facilities from the parent High Court.

32. There is also a practical aspect which cannot be overlooked. A Judge does not ordinarily choose the place of transfer in the same manner in which an individual chooses a place of employment or residence. A transfer is governed by the requirements of the institution and the constitutional framework governing the judiciary. It would be difficult to justify a construction under which a Judge, having served this Court for several years, loses access to the post-retirement scheme of this State merely because the exigencies of judicial administration resulted in his transfer to another High Court. Such a consequence ought not to be

attributed to the policy unless its language clearly compels that interpretation.

33. The requirement that a retired Judge should not be availing the same or similar facilities from another High Court provides a workable safeguard. It enables the State to verify whether the benefit is already being received elsewhere and to prevent any duplication. The object of the condition can thus be fully achieved without excluding a transferred Judge altogether. The administration of a welfare scheme must be guided by its purpose. Where two interpretations are possible, the one which advances that purpose, while preserving the safeguards expressly prescribed, deserves to be preferred over an interpretation which introduces an exclusion not found in the text.

34. It is also important to remember that the facilities in question are not being sought outside the framework of any existing policy. The State has already recognised these categories of assistance and prescribed the amounts payable. The Petitioner is not asking this Court to create a new allowance, determine a new rate or impose an unprovided financial obligation upon the State.

35. The State's reliance on the absence of an earlier instance in which similar benefits were extended to a Judge transferred from the Orissa High Court to another High Court and retired therefrom cannot, by itself, determine the question of entitlement. The issue must be decided on the language of the applicable notification and the governing directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Administrative novelty cannot substitute for an examination of the legal position.

36. The nature of the benefits also deserves notice. The allowances in question are intended to meet the practical requirements of a retired Judge, including domestic assistance, transport, security, secretarial services and communication facilities. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasised that such benefits should be extended in accordance with the applicable directions and schemes. The purpose would be defeated if a Judge who is otherwise eligible were denied the benefits merely because of a transfer during service, despite having elected to receive them from the parent High Court and subject to the condition that the same or similar facilities are not availed from another High Court.

37. This Court is, therefore, of the considered view that the Petitioner's claim cannot be rejected on the sole ground that he retired from the Calcutta High Court. Having regard to the clarification dated 15.4.2025, the separate directions concerning domestic help and other benefits, and the terms of the notification dated 24.4.2025, the Petitioner is entitled to avail the applicable post-retirement allowances from the State of Odisha through this Court, subject to the condition that he is not receiving the same or similar facilities from the Calcutta High Court or any other High Court.

V. CONCLUSION:

38. For the reasons stated above, the writ petition is allowed. The order No. 32393 dated 31.7.2025 issued by the Home Department, Government of Odisha, is set aside to the extent that it fails to consider and sanction the

Petitioner's claim for post-retirement allowances towards domestic help, driver, secretarial assistance, security and telephone facilities.

39. The Opposite Parties are directed to extend to the Petitioner the benefits admissible under the applicable orders and the Home Department notification dated 24.4.2025, at the rates in force from time to time, subject to verification that he is not availing the same or similar facilities from the Calcutta High Court or any other High Court. The arrears payable, if any, shall be determined in accordance with the applicable orders and the date from which the relevant benefits became admissible, and shall be released within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

40. On a parting note, it would be wise to remember that a Judge, during the years spent on the Bench, carries a responsibility that is both demanding and exacting. The work requires long hours, constant application of mind and an abiding sense of duty towards the institution and the people who approach it for justice. When such service comes to an end, the least that can be expected is that the person who has devoted those years to the institution is able to retire with dignity and without anxiety over basic necessities.

41. The facilities extended to retired Judges are not favours or concessions. They are intended to provide some measure of continuity and support after a lifetime spent in public service. Medical assistance, domestic help and telephone facilities serve a real and practical purpose in the post-retirement years. A retired Judge should not have to repeatedly approach government departments, pursue correspondence or

overcome procedural hurdles merely to obtain facilities which the State has itself recognised as necessary.

42. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has, in the proceedings in ***Justice V.S. Dave, President, Association of Retired Judges of Supreme Court and High Courts v. Kusumjit Sidhu & Ors.***(supra), been consistently addressing this very concern. By its order dated 18.2.2025, it directed the States and Union Territories to report compliance with its earlier directions concerning medical facilities, domestic help and telephone reimbursement. It also called upon the Registrar Generals of the High Courts to identify cases where retired Judges were facing difficulty in securing the benefits. More recently, by order dated 20.7.2026, the Hon'ble Supreme Court took note of the continuing differences in facilities provided by different States and called for the constitution of a Committee to formulate uniform guidelines. The concern, therefore, is not merely one of individual entitlement, but of ensuring that the welfare of retired members of the judiciary is not made dependent upon the State in which they happened to serve or the administrative arrangements prevailing there.

43. When the Hon'ble Supreme Court is itself seized of this larger issue and is taking steps towards ensuring uniformity in the facilities extended to retired Judges across the country, this Court cannot remain indifferent to the difficulties arising in the implementation of such benefits within its own jurisdiction. The endeavour of this Court must be to ensure that the policies and directions already in place are given meaningful effect

and that a retired member of the institution is not left to contend with avoidable administrative obstacles.

44. There is, of course, a need for rules, eligibility conditions and safeguards against duplication. But these must serve the administration of the scheme, not stand in its way. The manner in which an institution treats those who have served it is also a reflection of the institution itself. The relationship between the judiciary and its members does not end on the day a Judge demits office.

45. The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Dr. Sanjeeb K Panigrahi)
Judge

Murahari Sri Raman, J.- I agree

(Murahari Sri Raman)
Judge

Orissa High Court, Cuttack,
Dated the 2nd Nov., 2026/-